

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/800,374	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ARGILA, ANTHONY	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christine T. Cajilig	<b>Art Unit</b> 3633	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Christine T. Cajilig. (3) Leonard Belkin.  
 (2) Robert Canfield. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 05 December 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: Proposed amendments.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sourlis '037.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**Robert Canfield**  
**Primary Examiner**

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Differences between the instant invention and the prior art were discussed, specifically that the instant invention does not have flashing. Issues with regard to support for the limitation of "without flashing" was discussed and it was agreed that the specification does have adequate support. Furthermore, the claimed invention, in combination with the features of a drain channel in a foundation, without flashing, and with blocks that fill the bottom cell area of the masonry block is not disclosed in the prior art. Moreover, Applicant discussed submission of a 1.132 declaration, and the Examiners stated that it was not necessary. Nevertheless, all arguments and amendments will be considered upon filing of an amendment.